



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

certain great underlying movements or principles. The method set for this volume by the fact of its use in the first volume is a somewhat artificial and unnatural one in its rigid insistence upon a series of numbered sections and subsections throughout the volume.

In distinction from Professor König's attitude toward the indebtedness of Israel to foreign nations for religious and social ideas, that of Dr. Bertholet is very generous. He makes large place for the operation of outside influences upon Israel's thought, and especially for the influence of Greece. In the main, this is much nearer right than the view of König; but Bertholet falls back upon the theory of foreign influence at times too easily. It is certainly not necessary to attribute the universalism of the Psalter and of Jonah to hellenizing influences in any appreciable degree. The basis for the development of a universalistic attitude was already laid in the Servant of Yahweh songs. The assignment of Ecclesiastes and Zech., chaps. 9-14, to the Maccabean or later times seems unnecessary, if not impossible; and the placing of Habakkuk as a contemporary of Alexander the Great does not carry conviction, despite Duhm's clever advocacy of that view.

But the volume offers us, on the whole, the best and most comprehensive treatment of the religion of the Jews from the time of Ezra on. The general trend of Hebrew thought is clearly grasped and the spirit of the religious literature is distinctly perceived and appreciatively presented. Particularly good are the treatments of the religion of the law, the Psalter, and the Wisdom writings. As long as so much uncertainty prevails in reference to the dates of most of the literary sources for this period, it is, of course, impossible that anybody should succeed in so reconstructing the religious history of these times as to win universal approval. But this volume will prove helpful, even to those who differ from the author in many particulars, because of its abundant citation of facts and its suggestiveness in the interpretation of them. No better hand could have been found to carry the work of the late Professor Stade to completion. In spirit and in method the two volumes are one.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE HISTORICITY OF JESUS AND THE GOSPELS

We are being told by a number of vigorous writers that Jesus, instead of being a historical character, is a mythical character, that the Gospels, instead of being records of first-century events, are fictitious compositions, designed to present a series of mythical concepts. That this contention inverts all the existing evidence Professor Case

has made perfectly clear in a noteworthy book.¹ The root of the matter comes out clearly in the difference of method between a writer like Arthur Drews (author of *The Christ Myth*) and his Chicago critic. The one begins with a philosophical reflection, the other with a historical inquiry. Like the most rigid Christian orthodoxy, the mythologist conceives Jesus in purely dogmatic terms, as a concept related to a certain philosophic and theological system. This concept and this system are to him repugnant, therefore their reality is denied. So far so good. Then the conclusion thus a priori attained is given further support by appeal to historical data. Here the philosopher, not being a historian, nor possessing the historical sense, falls into difficulties and weakens his contention. The "Christ" of dogmatic systems may be a myth; philosophic considerations are at least in place against it. But the Jesus of history is wholly unaffected by such considerations. Whether or no he lived is a question for the historian to answer, differing in no wise from the question whether Seneca or Luther or Napoleon lived.

This Professor Case sees, and, without philosophic speculations as to the "Christ" of any system, he points out clearly and positively that the historic evidence demonstrates beyond any doubt that Jesus lived. The origin of the Christian movement, the mission and letters of Paul, the composition of the Gospels, the allusions in early non-Christian writings are explicable only on the hypothesis that the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels really lived, and that these gospels are history, perhaps with a measure of elaboration and idealization, but history still. It is perhaps a pity that this had to be demonstrated, but since it was necessary Professor Case has done it admirably. The English reader who can read the *Christ Myth* and then read the *Historicity of Jesus*, without being sure that Drews has no case whatever, is not to be envied.

As the deniers of Jesus' historicity agree with "orthodoxy" in viewing Jesus dogmatically, so too they agree that the original of the Jesus-figure was the God-man Christ, not a human being exalted to divine status, but a god brought down to earth. The position of Catholicism and conservative Protestantism, that Jesus is a superhuman divinity, is correct, says Drews, and he joins these forces in polemic against the common enemy, "liberal" Protestantism. The Jesus who is a great religious man is a creation of the Protestant theologians of the nineteenth

¹ *The Historicity of Jesus. A Criticism of the Contention that Jesus Never Lived, a Statement of the Evidence for His Existence, an Estimate of His Relation to Christianity.* By Shirley Jackson Case. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1912. vii+352 pages. \$1.50.

century, we are told, the miraculous dying God is the only Christ whom the first century knew, and that only in faith. Case's first chapter therefore deals with the "historical Jesus" of liberal theology. The chapter is brief and necessarily inadequate, but at least leaves the clear impression that the historical Jesus was found in the Synoptic Gospels, not in the brains of modern theologians. The next three chapters present the negative statement and the historical arguments adduced in its favor. The summary of the literature here is extremely valuable, and the thesis that the mere statement of an untenable hypothesis is often its best refutation is strikingly exemplified. At the same time the weakness of the so-called "proofs" is pointed out, and positive errors are corrected. The last chapters present the positive evidence, canonical and non-canonical, for Jesus' existence. That this evidence cannot be denied or explained away, as Drews would do, is clear. With perfect positiveness and simplicity Professor Case has put the whole matter in the proper light and won the gratitude of every English reader. Not least among the book's merits is the fine appreciation, at the end, of Jesus as a religious man and a helper and friend of all religious men. There is nothing dogmatic, nothing of theology, here, but only what is deeply and wisely Christian.

In 1909 the Jewish savant, Solomon Reinach, issued in Paris a brief manual of the general history of religions, including Judaism and Christianity, from the dawn of history to the present day. This volume, entitled *Orpheus*, sprang into an immediate vogue, and was widely translated (English edition by Miss Florence Simmonds. London: Heinemann, 1909). Not less immediate and marked was the criticism it provoked from a wide variety of sources. Among earlier critics was Loisy, soon followed by Batiffol, who published in 1910, under the title *Orpheus et l'Évangile*, a series of eight lectures delivered before a representative Catholic audience in Versailles. The theme of the lectures is expressed in the title *The Credibility of the Gospel* of the English translation (by Rev. G. C. H. Pollen, S.J.).² Their substance is "a Catholic reply to *Orpheus*," in the form of a criticism of Reinach's chapter on "Christian Origins." That it is a Catholic reply conditions, of course, its position and general conclusions. It is a restatement of the tradition of the church. And yet its method is that of modern scientific scholarship; it rests on adequate knowledge, not only of the sources, but of the best critical work of our times. There is no hesitation to engage in the critical examination of the tradition, even if the tradition

² *The Credibility of the Gospel*. By Monseigneur Pierre Batiffol. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1912. 220 pages. \$1.50 net.

always emerges unscathed. "We can trust the church of the second century" (p. 154). "We can trust the church of all time" (p. 156). So of the "assertions in the Fourth Gospel which cannot be verified by history. We hold them to be true because they are inspired, and we hold them to be inspired because the church guarantees them as such" (p. 156). Here speaks the true Catholic.

Yet the critical discussion is for the most part such as a scholarly, conservative Protestant theologian might offer. A large part of the work is naturally occupied with the sources for our knowledge of the life of Jesus, their authenticity and trustworthiness. While there are few, if any, new points of view, excellent are the chapters on the non-canonical evidence, the demonstration that Paul had full knowledge of Jesus' career, and the discussion of the synoptic problem. Fresh and persuasive is the argument in the seventh lecture for the authenticity of the synoptic utterances of Jesus, based on their unity of conception, their inimitable style, and their exact conformity to the local and temporal setting. Less convincing are the chapter on Acts, following Harnack's latest view, and much of the last chapter, which treats of the miracles and other less natural elements of the gospel story. Yet here too there are points well taken, such as the refutation of Reinach's resolution of the Passion into a mythical echo of the Sacae festival, and the caution concerning the use of Old Testament passages as the origin of gospel episodes. On the whole, wherever positions advanced in *Orpheus* are directly controverted, Batiffol is usually right and Reinach wrong. As a piece of sober, popular apologetic the work is commended, and those who do not have its material conveniently at hand elsewhere will do well to make its closer acquaintance.

CLAYTON R. BOWEN

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

STUDIES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Of the three studies here noted, that of Wendt¹ is literary, Overbeck's² is primarily historical, while Büchsel's³ is biblico-theological. For some

¹ *Die Schichten im vierten Evangelium*. Von H. H. Wendt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1911. 158 pages. M. 4.40.

² *Das Johannesevangelium: Studien zur Kritik seiner Erforschung*. Von F. Overbeck. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von C. A. Bernoulli. Tübingen: Mohr, 1911. xii+540 pages. M. 12.

³ *Der Begriff der Wahrheit in dem Evangelium und den Briefen des Johannes* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. XV, 3). Von F. Büchsel. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1911. 144 pages. M. 2.80.